



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/479,913	01/10/2000	Cory E. Klatt	004944.85640	3689
23623	7590	06/09/2011		
TUROCY & WATSON, LLP 127 Public Square 57th Floor, Key Tower CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER PHAM, THIERRY L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
setoori@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/479,913

Applicant(s)

KLATT ET AL.

Examiner

THIERRY PHAM

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-16,25-29,38-42,44-50 and 55-78 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,17-24,30-37,43 and 51-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Response to election/restriction requirement dated 4/11/2011.
- Claims 1-78 are currently pending.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of species B (fig. 12) in the reply filed on 4/11/2011 is acknowledged. Species B (fig. 12) reads on claims 1-9, 17-24, 30-37, 43, 51-54, and not claims as specified by the applicants. Claims 10-16, 25-29, 38-43, 44-50, and 55-78 are withdrawn from consideration due to non-elected species.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 5/7/2004 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the cited NPL documents on page 2 of IDS were not received by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 18-22, filed 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 17-24, 30-37, 43, 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell et al (US 5717841) and in view of Yaksich et al (US 5563999).

Regarding claim 1, Farrell discloses a computer system (*figs. 1-2*) for designating rules (*trigger event rules/parameters, fig. 5b, 9-12, col. 6, lines 45-65 and cols. 9-10*) for determining when print orders (*inactive print jobs to be generated and printed, figs. 5b, 9-12*) to be generated from events occurring on a database (*database, cols. 9-10*) comprising:

- an input device (*figs. 5b*) for receiving user input;
- a display (*user interface, figs. 5b, 9-12, col. 7, lines 30-45*) having a first display region displaying an item to be printed (*inactive print jobs to be printed when events are triggered, cols. 6-10*) and a second display region displaying menu of events (*trigger events parameters to be selected, cols. 6-10*) associated with said database;
- a processor (*fig. 5b*) for receiving a user input selecting said item and one of said menu of said events;
- a storage (*fig. 5b, and col. 9, lines 20-65*) for storing an event rule relating said selected event and said selected item;
- wherein, upon occurrence of said selected event, a print order (*inactive print jobs to be printed when events are triggered, cols. 6-10*) relating to said item is generated.

Farrell discloses trigger events associated with a database in general (col. 9, lines 9-10, col. 11, lines 28-60), but fails to expressly indicate such database include sale management database.

Yaksich, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well known system that includes a sales management database (sales of business forms database, *figs. 1-8*) wherein when a business forms (e.g. business forms are to be sold to customers) is updated from a database, the

updated forms are transmitted to customers for printing (including vendors and customers, see col. 2, lines 13-67, col. 6, lines 35-50, cols. 39-40, and cols. 69-70). Also, sales management database are well known and widely implemented in various industries including printing, shipping, communication, and etc.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify printing system of Farrell to include plurality of databases (e.g. sales management database) as taught by Yaksich. Other databases can also be implemented including human resource database, inventory database, and etc. Both Farrell and Yaksich teach advantages of automatically generating print orders based upon triggers events (see columns 1-2 of both references).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Farrell with Yaksich to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Yaksich further teaches the computer system for designating rules according to claim 1, wherein said second display region includes at least one event chosen from a new contact added to the sales management database and a contact rising to a new status level (updated/new customer profiles, cols. 17-54).

Regarding claims 3-5, Farrell further discloses the computer system for designating rules according to claim 1, further comprising: a third display region displaying to where the output of a print order is to be sent (col. 6, lines 50 to col. 7, lines 25).

Regarding claim 6, Yaksich further teaches the computer system for designating rules according to claim 1, wherein the items related to different versions of sale packets (different versions of business forms, cols. 1-2).

Regarding claims 7-8, 17-24, 30-37, 43, 51-54 which recite limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claims 1-6 above and/or combination thereof; therefore, claims 7-8, 17-24, 30-37, 43, 51-54 are rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1-6 above and/or combination thereof.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THIERRY PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman can be reached on (571) 272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thierry L Pham/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625